

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-16, 20-38, 43, 45 and 48-50 were pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 20 are amended above. New claims 51 and 52 are added above. No new matter is added by the claim amendments and new claims. Entry is respectfully requested.

The Applicant notes, with appreciation, that the Office Action indicates at page 7, lines 20 through page 8, line 1, that claims 48-50 are allowed and that claims 10 and 32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. New claim 51 incorporates the limitations of former claim 1 and claim 10. New claim 52 incorporates the limitations of former claim 20 and claim 32. New claims 51 and 52 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad (U.S. Patent Number 6,190,749) in view of Kimbro (U.S. Patent Number 6,718,589) and Burrows (U.S. Patent Number 3,197,169). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad in view of Kimbro and Burrows and further in view of Siemund, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 4,077,083). Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad in view of Kimbro and Burrows and further in view of Hulterstrum (U.S. Patent Number 3,433,510). Claims 20-26, 28-31 and 33-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad in view of Kimbro, Burrows and Hulterstrum and further in view of Newville (U.S. Patent Number 5,551,115). Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad in view of Kimbro, , Burrows, Hulterstrum and Newville and further in view of Siemund, *et al.* Reconsideration and removal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In the present invention as claimed in independent claim 1, a mount includes an elongated body having a longitudinal axis, a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body and a mounting member which includes an adjustable-length pole for mounting to a coupler. The mounting member includes a compression mechanism along a longitudinal axis thereof. The

mounting member is of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room. The compression mechanism is configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the mounting member and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room.

In the present invention as claimed in independent claim 20, a mounting system includes an adjustable-length pole which includes a compression mechanism to allow for compression along a longitudinal axis thereof. The mounting system further includes an elongated body having a longitudinal axis. A curtain interface is positioned at a top surface of the body. The adjustable-length pole is of a sufficient size to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room. The compression mechanism is configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the adjustable-length pole and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room.

Morad discloses a sponge mop with a mop handle 9. It is stated in the Office Action at page 3, lines 13-15, that Morad fails to teach the mounting pole including a compression mechanism along a longitudinal axis thereof.

Morad fails to teach or suggest a mount that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and “a mounting member” which includes “an adjustable-length pole”, “the mounting member including a compression mechanism along a longitudinal axis thereof, the mounting member being of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the mounting member and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 1. Instead in Morad, the handle 9 does not include a compression mechanism.

In addition, Morad fails to teach or suggest a mounting system that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and an “adjustable-length pole” that includes “a compression mechanism to allow for compression along a longitudinal axis thereof” and “is of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the adjustable-length pole and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 20. Instead in Morad, the handle 9 does not include a compression mechanism.

Kimbro discloses a push broom. The push broom includes a brush head 11, a handle with linear sections 15 and 16 and a compression spring which allows the sections of the handle of the push broom to expand with respect to one another when there is no load placed on the handle or at least a partial load. The compression spring reduces energy needed from the user and creates a much softer and smoother motion during a sweeping procedure. It is stated in the Office Action, at page 4, lines 5-9, that Morad in view of Kimbro fails to teach the mounting member to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room such that when the mounting member is under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the mounting member and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room.

Like Morad, Kimbro fails to teach or suggest a mount that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and “a mounting member” which includes “an adjustable-length pole”, “the mounting member including a compression mechanism along a longitudinal axis thereof, the mounting member being of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the mounting member and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 1. The compression spring of Kimbro is in no way configured to

fix the brush head 11 and handle with linear sections 15 and 16 “between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, whereby the compression mechanism is compressed when the pole and body are mounted to retain the pole and body in the fixed position”. Rather, in Kimbro, the compression spring is used to reduce energy exerted by a user in a sweeping procedure.

In addition, like Morad, Kimbro fails to teach or suggest a mounting system that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and an “adjustable-length pole” that includes “a compression mechanism to allow for compression along a longitudinal axis thereof” and “is of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the adjustable-length pole and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 20. The compression spring of Kimbro is in no way configured to fix the brush head 11 and handle with linear sections 15 and 16 “between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, whereby the compression mechanism is compressed when the pole and body are mounted to retain the pole and body in the fixed position”. Rather, in Kimbro, the compression spring is used to reduce energy exerted by a user in a sweeping procedure.

Burrows discloses a hanger and guard device that is adapted to be seated on an end of a broom. The device includes outer fin portions 24 that protrude beyond a circumference of a body portion 14. The outer fins 24 provide a bumper against which the broom handle rests when the broom is leaned against a wall, which protects the wall or wallpaper from scratches or other markings from the broom.

Like Morad and Kimbro, Burrows fails to teach or suggest a mount that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and “a mounting member” which includes “an adjustable-length pole”, “the mounting member including a compression mechanism along a longitudinal axis thereof, the mounting member being of a sufficient length

to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the mounting member and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 1. In addition, like Morad and Kimbro, Burrows fails to teach or suggest a mounting system that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and an “adjustable-length pole” that includes “a compression mechanism to allow for compression along a longitudinal axis thereof” and “is of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the adjustable-length pole and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 20. Instead in Burrows, the outer fins 24 which operate as a bumper are positioned at a side portion of the Burrows broom handle 11. The outer fins 24 of Burrows are not positioned at a top surface of the Burrows broom handle 11. In addition, in Burrows, there is no “compression mechanism”, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 20. Further, if the broom handle hanger and guard of Burrows were to be applied to the end of the Kimbro push broom, the outer fins 24 of the Burrows hanger and guard would not be “urged” against an abutting room surface by the spring of the Kimbro push broom, but, rather, the bail handle 23 of Burrows would be “urged” in this manner, potentially causing damage to the abutting room surface. With regard to the assertion in the Office Action, at page 4, lines 10-13, that Burrows teaches a device having a mounting member 11 including a guard 12 attached to the free end of the mounting member such that when the device is leaned against a wall the position of the device is maintained relative to the floor, the broom of Burrows is not “fixed” between first and second surfaces, as claimed in claims 1 and 20, but rather is merely leaning against a second surface.

None of Morad, Kimbro and Burrows teaches or suggests the present invention as claimed in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Morad, Kimbro and Burrows fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in independent

claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection of and allowance of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad, Kimbro and Burrows are respectfully requested. With regard to the dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11 and 15-16, it follows that these claims should inherit the allowability of the independent claim from which they depend.

With regard to the rejection of claim 6, Siemund, *et al.* discloses a retainer for a sponge rubber mop. Siemund, *et al.*, like Morad, Kimbro and Burrows, fails to teach or suggest a mount that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and “a mounting member” which includes “an adjustable-length pole”, “the mounting member including a compression mechanism along a longitudinal axis thereof, the mounting member being of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the mounting member and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in claim 6.

None of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows and Siemund, *et al.* teaches or suggests the present invention as claimed in claim 6. Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows and Siemund, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 6. Reconsideration of the rejection of and allowance of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad, Kimbro, Burrows and Siemund, *et al.* are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 12-14, Hulterstrum discloses a brush structure with a swivel joint. Hulterstrum is cited in the Office Action as teaching a ball and socket joint. Hulterstrum fails to teach or suggest a mount that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and “a mounting member” which includes “an adjustable-length pole”, “the mounting member including a compression mechanism along a longitudinal axis thereof, the mounting member being of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression

between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the mounting member and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in claims 12-14.

None of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows and Hulterstrum teaches or suggests the present invention as claimed in claims 12-14. Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows and Hulterstrum fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 12-14. Reconsideration of the rejection of and allowance of claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad, Kimbro, Burrows and Hulterstrum are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claim 20, like Morad, Kimbro and Burrows, as discussed above, Hulterstrum fails to teach or suggest a mounting system that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and an “adjustable-length pole” that includes “a compression mechanism to allow for compression along a longitudinal axis thereof” and “is of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the adjustable-length pole and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 20.

Newville discloses a brush assembly 10 which includes a tubular handle 12 and a brush head 14. Newville is cited in the Office Action as teaching a coupler limiting lateral rotation of the body relative to the pole, while permitting rotation of the body relative to the pole in another direction of rotation.

Like Morad, Kimbro, Burrows and Hulterstrum, Newville fails to teach or suggest a mounting system that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and an “adjustable-length pole” that includes “a compression mechanism to allow for compression along a longitudinal axis thereof” and “is of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the

curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the adjustable-length pole and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in independent claim 20.

None of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows, Hulterstrum and Newville teaches or suggests the present invention as claimed in independent claim 20. Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows, Hulterstrum and Newville fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in independent claim 20. Reconsideration of the rejection of and allowance of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad, Kimbro, Burrows, Hulterstrum and Newville are respectfully requested. With regard to the dependent claims 21-26, 28-31 and 33-38, it follows that these claims should inherit the allowability of the independent claims from which they depend.

With regard to the rejection of claim 27, like Morad, Kimbro, Burrows, Hulterstrum and Newville, as discussed above, Siemund, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a mounting system that includes “a curtain interface positioned at a top surface of the body”, and an “adjustable-length pole” that includes “a compression mechanism to allow for compression along a longitudinal axis thereof” and “is of a sufficient length to be fixed between a first surface of a room and a second surface of a room, the compression mechanism configured to urge the curtain interface toward one of the first surface and the second surface of the room when under compression between the first and second surfaces of the room to retain the adjustable-length pole and body in a fixed position relative to the first and second surfaces of the room”, as claimed in claim 27.

None of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows, Hulterstrum, Newville and Siemund, *et al.* teaches or suggests the present invention as claimed in claim 27. Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Morad, Kimbro, Burrows, Hulterstrum, Newville and Siemund, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 27. Reconsideration of the rejection of and allowance of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morad, Kimbro, Burrows, Hulterstrum, Newville and Siemund, *et al.* are respectfully requested.

Closing Remarks

It is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If prosecution of the application can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number given below.

There are no fees believed due at this time, however, authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account No. 501798 for any fees which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 1, 2008
Mills & Onello, LLP
Eleven Beacon Street, Suite 605
Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: (617) 994-4900, Ext. 4902
Facsimile: (617) 742-7774
J:ZIP008\AmendF\amendment.wpd

Anthony P. Onello, Jr.
Anthony P. Onello, Jr.
Registration Number 38,572
Attorney for Applicant